

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

IN RE: E. I. DU PONT DE
NEMOURS AND COMPANY C-8
PERSONAL INJURY LITIGATION,

Civil Action 2:13-md-2433
JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Preston Deavers

This document relates to:

Angela Swartz and Teddy Swartz v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, Case No. 2:18-cv-00136

Travis Abbott and Julie Abbott, et al. v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co., et al., Case No. 2:17-cv-00998

EVIDENTIARY MOTIONS ORDER NO. 30

Plaintiffs' Motions to Exclude General Causation Opinions and Testimony

This matter is before the Court on:

(1) Plaintiffs Angela and Teddy Swartz's Motion to Exclude the Opinions and Testimony of Defense Expert Witnesses Dr. Samul Cohen and Dr. Marion Fedoruk Relating to General Causation (*Swartz* ECF No. 54), Defendant's Memorandum in Opposition (*Swartz* ECF No. 62), and Plaintiffs' Reply (*Swartz* ECF No. 80), and

(2) Plaintiffs Travis and Julie Abbott's Motion to Exclude the Opinions and Testimony of Defense Expert Witnesses Dr. Samul Cohen and Dr. Marion Fedoruk Relating to General Causation (*Abbott* ECF No. 66), Defendant's Memorandum in Opposition (*Abbott* ECF No. 71), and Plaintiffs' Reply (*Abbott* ECF No. 89).

In DuPont's memoranda in opposition, it indicates that this Court has ruled on the opinions of the experts previously, most fully in Evidentiary Motions Order No. 24. (EMO 24, Pls' Mots. Directed at Defense Experts Dr. Weed, Dr. Rickard, and Dr. Fedoruk, MDL ECF No. 5077.) DuPont states that it "is mindful of the Court's prior rulings, and intends to fully comply with them (Def's Mem. in Opp. at 1–2, *Swartz* ECF No. 62.) Accordingly, the Court need not re-address these issues and **DENIES** as **MOOT** Plaintiffs' Motions. (*Swartz* ECF No. 54; *Abbott* ECF No. 66.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12-31-2019
DATE


EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE